

---

**JULIA CHARVOLEN:** Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large ICANN Academy Working Group call on Tuesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> of April, 2013 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today we have Sandra Hoferichter, Glenn McKnight, Avri Doria, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yaovi Atohoun, Oksana Prykhodko, Ron Sherwood and Liz Sweezey. We have apologies, I'm sorry, from Hong Xue, Jonathan Cohen, Thomas Rickert and Natalia Enciso and from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, Gisella Gruber and myself Julia Charvolen. May I remind all participants to please state their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

**SANDRA HOFERICHTER:** Thank you very much Julia and Silvia, Heidi, Gisella for supporting us and thank you also for participating in this late call prior to the Beijing meeting. This call will only have one purpose and I recognize there was a demand on the mailing list, or in this Working Group to discuss in a little bit more [in detail? 00:01:28] survey outcomes. I'll go through the questions one by one and I have prepared a presentation and I'd just like to reassure... Are you all able to [draw/draft? 00:01:40] this presentation on your own screen as far as you are connected to Adobe Connect?

**HEIDI ULLRICH:** Sandra, this is Heidi. I think some people are not able to hear you so can you speak up a little bit louder please?

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, I'll try not to yell at you. Is it better now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For me it is much better. Yaovi can you hear anything.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes, it's better.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, so the purpose for tonight is go through the survey one by one and I prepared a presentation whereby [interference] questions which are part of the survey and all the answers are listed. And I would ask this group to agree on the conclusion we can draw from the results from the responses we received and we will then present those in Beijing during the ICANN Academy meeting, and also during other occasions of the At-Large or at the ALAC meetings.

So the first slide... Heidi I just have to reassure, when I scroll is this then for all the participants as well or do they have to do it on their own?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Sandra, I'm just checking, are you able to scroll? Yaovi, you're saying you can't? You're Chair, you're host Sandra so you will be able to. I think you should be able to scroll down. Actually, no, now everyone should be able to scroll on their own?

---

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, I'm just wondering... Okay, so I'm on the second slide, which is the purpose of the survey. Just to recall, the Toronto meeting, after the Toronto meeting it was decided that we set up a survey to find out a little bit more about the needs from the different Stakeholder Groups and a small group of volunteers drafted a survey actually in Toronto, and it was finished later on, on the ICANN Academy mailing list. The purpose of the survey was three-fold.

First, want to map all the existing capacity building provisions within ICANN, and with capacity building we only speak about education... Education of capacity building. Second purpose was to help to identify what's possibly missing, what is the demand from the different Stakeholder Groups. And the third purpose was looking forward to harmonize and to synchronize all the current and future models, which are offered in ICANN or to the group or in a constituency – not necessarily during an ICANN meeting but during the year for their own community.

So I'll go to the next slide then, which is called [Defected? 00:05:12]. As a result we surveyed 14 questions, we tried to make it as compromised as possible but still 14 questions were to be answered. It was sent out to all ICANN Stakeholder Groups. In the first place they were sent out to the Chairs with a question... With a request to forward this to their communities and they had the chance either to submit [interference] one survey per Stakeholder Group. It depends on the way they are structured and the way they are organized. It was also possible to submit multiple surveys from one Stakeholder Group.

---

We started the survey at the end of November. Actually it was planned to have the survey open until before Christmas... By the 20<sup>th</sup> of December we realized okay, the time was probably a little bit too short and the Christmas break will keep people... Or the time before Christmas break keeps people busy, so we gave an extension until the 4<sup>th</sup> of January. In this time we received 22 – and I put 21 in brackets – responded because the survey results clearly state 21 responses but when I count the detailed fact sheet, which is also available on the ICANN... On the Wiki Space, 22 responses, so I may have to check that with Matt or Avri later on, but this is still something that has to be sorted out, to be very precise in this regard.

Unfortunately we had no participation from the ASO, from the RSSAC and from the SSAC, but all other constituencies, or sometimes also the Stakeholder Groups, did participate in this survey. I'll go onto the next slide where I am at the responses [interference] Stakeholder Group. We can see we have a huge participation from the At-Large, but this is not surprising because we have five regions and At-Large is structured in a very much bottom-up way, so different At-Large communities, ALSs, credit in this survey.

From NARALO I know they [interference 00:08:07] the RALO, so this is why we have a pretty good participation from the At-Large community compared to the other constituencies. We have one result from the ccNSO, two from the GAC, from the gNSO the participation was pretty good; six responses from them, and one from the business constituency, and from the Registry Stakeholder Group, and one from NomCom. In

---

total, as you would count them, 22, but later on in the survey it says 21, that's why I've put that in brackets.

Okay. Now I would actually like to start the analysis of the questions, one by one. And this is also the point where I actually am more interested in what you have to say to each of the questions. I will take my notes and put in the conclusions to be presented during the meeting in Beijing. The first question was just a general one, to put in the details. I think to really draw a conclusion from that, I think the conclusion or the analysis we would give at this stage is what I have on the two sheets before, actually, which are in effect the breakdown of our survey. At this point I'd like to ask are there any remarks on the first question or on what I have presented so far? I would then ask you to raise your hand in the Adobe Chat Room, or when you're on the phone just say your name.

Okay, Yaovi you raised your hand. You have the floor please. Yaovi, you might be muted?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. My apologies... Can you hear me?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, we can hear you. Very...

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Is it better? Yaovi speaking.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, it is better Yaovi, please go on.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay, my question is about the number of answers, like some constituencies. We have more than one answer so the question, directly to the group or to members of the group, my provision is to have one answer from each constituency. I take a particular example like [inaudible phrase 00:11:25] of our members so [inaudible 00:11:30] more than one answer. I don't know if I made myself clear, thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yeah, Yaovi, this is what I tried to explain before is it depends on how the constituency or how the Stakeholder Group is organized. Some Stakeholder Groups are indicated already that it won't be possible to submit one survey representing the opinion of the entire Stakeholder Group, so they decided to submit multiple surveys, like for the NPOC. Other constituency or Stakeholder Groups, like I assume it's the case for NARALO or for AFRALO; they represented one survey representing the whole Stakeholder Group. So we have to take this into account, that the results are a sort of mixture between individual answers of individual members and answers representing a whole Stakeholder Group. Yaovi, does that answer your question?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you very much. Yaovi.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. Are there any other questions or remarks so far? Okay. This is not the case but I take Yaovi's intervention as one of the conclusions

---

---

that we have to make that clear; that the results of the survey are a mixture of individual answers and answers representing a Stakeholder Group.

Okay, let's go to the next slide then. It's a question... The question was... I'll read it: 'Do the group or committee perform any educational training?' The reason why we asked this question was we like to find out what kind of training is in place already for specific groups, and as an example we said that it could be like a tech-day for the ccNSO. Almost all participants answered this question and from the answers we could see that yes, they are performing educational training and on the next slide I listed the answers.

So the question was: 'If yes, if you perform educational training then please describe.' And at this stage I would like to ask you what could be the conclusion out of this, because the answers are pretty much diverse, very detailed. I'll try to enlarge this a little bit so that you may be able to read it better. It's a bit too small; the window is a bit too small to enlarge it. But you can also find all these answers in the Excel sheet, which is on the Wiki Space.

Any comments or questions on this question or on question number two? Okay, this is not the case, so my conclusion would be that half of the respondents said yes, okay, we perform something but you have to look very much in detail what they are offering as capacity building. Almost another half says no, we do not perform any educational training.

---

And from this I would draw the conclusion that if half of the respondents of the Stakeholder Groups do not perform educational training there must be a space for improvement; space for improvement, which could be a module later on, filled in the ICANN Academy [frame? 00:16:30] review. You might remember this pyramid? We were just discussing it. Okay, questions on the conclusions? Because I don't want to draw all the conclusions on my own, I'm actually more interested in what you have to say and what conclusions you would draw from, let's say, such a 50/50 answer, but lots of detailed... Any recommendations?

Okay, this is not the case then I move onto the next slide, which is question number three. The question was: 'Do you provide educational training or capacity-development programs for individual participants in your community?' With this question we would like to find out what kind of educational training is already in place for your community. These individual participants are not necessarily active on ICANN meeting attendees or participants who are organized in ICANN Group or Committee; we focus here on people who are working for a registry, registrar or any other effective business, for instance. This question was that we expect that some Stakeholder Groups do offer capacity building outside of ICANN, which has nothing to do with the ICANN meeting at all but which is an educational ground for the Stakeholder Group.

It could be, for instance, what RIPE is offering. RIPE for instance is offering a lot of capacity building for their community, for their Stakeholder Group. They're doing this not in line with ICANN meetings, they're doing this during the year and the rationale was to find out what they are doing and what is already in place. And you see there is 38%



---

who say yes, we are doing something, but the majority of respondents said no, there is nothing in place. So for me this would be another indicator to say okay, there is space where ICANN can actually fill a gap and offer also capacity building provisions, not only for ICANN attendees but also for wider communities; for At-Large it could be the ALS, which is not necessarily attending the ICANN meetings. For the technical community it could be the technicians, the employees and registries and companies, and so on and so forth.

And this could be something that could be offered by ICANN in the future, and a good tool for this is actually the online platform that is currently under development by ICANN staff, and they engaged [Matthew Shrewsbury]. I made the announcement on the mailing list and I guess you heard about this already. If you did not hear about this please ask your questions now at this stage; I will be happy to give you some more background on this but this question, from my point of view, goes very much into there is a need and at this stage we should look into online tools to provide additional capacity building for the groups that are not necessarily attending ICANN meetings. Are there any questions or comments on this question number three? This is not the case. I hope you can understand and hear me, all, because, [laughing] no interaction at all. That's unusual.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

We can hear you, Sandra. [laughing]

---

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, so I will then move onto the next slide. Yeah, this is the deeper analysis for question number three; which kind of training they offer. And you can actually see that it is now Internet Governance mentioning all the countries where the participants came from. This shows pretty clear that provisions that are offered outside of ICANN do reach the global community, as long as they are in place already, and so I would say if ICANN is giving more effort into the global community and also offers capacity building for the broader... Yeah, for a broader audience, then this would be very well received, also, in the [latest? 00:22:33] corner of the world.

So I'll move onto question number four. And this is pretty clear: 'Have you identified any education, training, orientation needs or capacity-development programs for your participants in ICANN?' In this question we are focusing on active ICANN contributors, organized in ICANN or group committees. So this is actually the opposite from question number three where we were looking into the global community not attending ICANN meetings or not necessarily attending ICANN meetings. We are looking with this question detailed into what are the needs for those who are ICANN volunteers, who are participating in meetings and are contributing to policy-making processes within ICANN.

And it says pretty clear, yes, there is a demand. So this is, for me, a very clear sign to move forward with the ICANN Academy concept with the different modules, which I have mentioned already as a conclusion from before, so actually this is the most and clearest answer from me, at this stage. Any comments or questions on this question number four?

---

Okay, this is not the case then I'll move forward to question number five. The question was: If you have answered yes to the question above, which needs were identified? Select all that apply. I tried to enlarge this a little bit. Okay, so a majority says, okay, we are looking into or we have identified training or orientation needs for new members in our group. We did an idea where the ICANN Academy concept or the face-to-face leadership program or the online platform we are discussing now, came from. The new member... It takes a very long time for new members to get to full speed, to be full, active participants within ICANN before they understand how it functions and all that. I think all that is behind this answer.

The second option was: 'Training or orientation needs for the community.' This goes back to question number three where we said, okay, do you have any needs for your broader community who are not necessarily ICANN attendees? Even there is a strong majority who said yes, there are training and orientation, ICANN and it's processes. It's still obviously an issue where we have to look into more detail how to explain to the different groups what ICANN processes are.

And I think this comes from the phenomenon that all the Stakeholder Groups are more or less sitting in their SILOs and [be with their sing? 00:26:34], but they don't necessarily have the overview which is going on elsewhere in ICANN, and to get the whole picture about ICANN and its processes. Still, the majority says yes, there is a need or they need clarity on how to participate in ICANN. I think this might affect especially those who are not yet participants in ICANN but who maybe would like

---

to become more. People who should be convinced to become an active participant.

The next one was: 'Issues your group or your community is dealing with specifically', even though there is a pretty much majority – 66% which said yes – this is still an issue; where we have training or orientation needs. Surprisingly, for me, the development or improvement of leadership skills for your group representatives was not seen by the majority as a training or orientation need, because this was something where the ICANN... Where the face-to-face leadership program was. Not mainly focusing on, but it was on the Agenda; to say our leaders, our Chairs, our Working Group leaders, they have to deal with other Working Group leaders, they have to lead a group and it might be worthwhile to give them some more tools of how to find consensus, how to negotiate, how to participate in the policy development process, and so on and so forth. But obviously this is not on top of the Agenda from the stakeholders. Understanding current issues under discussion in ICANN was answered by 100%. Everybody in the opinion that this should be discussed or that there should be capacity building provisions in this regard, for there is more need for explanation.

Next one was: 'Understanding ICANN mission and responsibilities.' A majority also said yes, we need clarity on that; understanding ICANN's role in the Internet eco-system. I think under the current discussion with [Rickert? 00:29:25], this is even more on top of the Agenda than it was when this survey was drafted, actually. So I think this is an issue that should definitely be dealt with. There was also half of the people who said okay, online training is a need but we have identified 'other

---

topics'. Other topics were only 33% and I listed those other topics on the next slide, and I will not go into detail because these are very personal statements and very personal views, which are worth looking at, and should be discussed but they are, for a general conclusion, a little bit difficult to map. Any questions or comments on question number five? Because this was a rather large question with multiple answers.

Yes, Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Yaovi. Yeah, we can see that we have 100% for 'understanding current issues under discussion in ICANN', and also a personal view isn't very important for ICANN Academy because current issues are changing so [inaudible 00:31:21] require a lot of work done within ICANN. I think this topic [like how structured the? inaudible 00:31:35] for me. The [AMALO? 00:31:230] thinks that people can [stand down? 00:31:33] easily, but when we talk about current issues under discussion, they are important, they are changing, they have evolved. So this year it requires from ICANN Academy a lot of work, because [inaudible 00:32:02] discussion or cause for comment.

People meeting... There is a bad communication of discussions on ICANN web page that is not easy for other [constituencies? 00:32:11] to understand. So I think that it is a big thing for ICANN Academy to have something like that. The Academy provide something online or maybe in other languages or in a simple language, that people can understand quickly and then they can [communicate it? 00:32:32] to the [Leaders O? 00:32:33] to [enlist? 00:32:35] that people are 100%... The people are

---

really important to understand current issues in ICANN. This is my comment that this will require a lot of work for the Academy. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Yaovi. A little bit difficult to understand you, but I'd just like to repeat what I understood, and please correct me if I understood it wrong. You mentioned that understanding current ICANN issues, which received 100% of replies, of answers, will take a lot of effort to be organized, to be settled in framework like the ICANN Academy. And as far as I understood you, you think it is not possible to do this maybe in the face-to-face leadership programs and not only in... Or not only with one tool but it should be a separate module where we have to draw a lot of attention, obviously. Is that right, Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes, it is.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, thank you. I absolutely agree with you and when I remember, when I recall what was drafted almost one year ago, it was a three-day curriculum on understanding current ICANN issues was included in this curriculum. I think, if I recall it right, it was for one day, dealing only with current ICANN issues, but this might be even too less or maybe not enough to cover current ICANN issues under discussion. And I think we might have to look into other tools and other modules how we could cover this gap and how this could be dealt with, because we cannot have

---

this all in one, two days, three days, leadership program only and not give them an online tool alone; I think this must be a joint effort between the different tools and the synchronization and harmonization, which should focus very much on current ICANN issues and how they could be explained, how you could deal with them in a better way than is the case now. Any other questions or comments?

Okay, this is not the case so I will move forward to question number six: 'Which target groups in your organization might benefit from capacity-development programs?' We offered a choice of answers; it could be newcomer, observers, contributors, leaders and others. And actually, the terminology of those participants was drawn from the ICANN strategy, which was developed and presented last year in Costa Rica, because these are exactly the stake groups which were defined, first constituency wise, by ICANN staff and where the outreach program, or the outreach effort, is actually built on. So the majority... Actually, there is a majority for all these Stakeholder Group, except for observers and for others. Others were... Or what 'others' mean is listed in the small table next to the answer and I don't think we have to pay that much attention to others, but we should pay attention to newcomers, to contributors and to leaders.

And looking at the newcomers, we have programs already in place, like the newcomers' launch, the fellowship programs, which somehow covers for the newcomers but obviously must be improved. And I think this is no question because this is an ongoing process. And we have the contributors. I think these are people who are contributing or who are members of a Stakeholder Group like the ALAC or the NPOC or whoever.

---

So these people might be... Or are seen as to be benefit a lot of any program to be developed, and of course the leaders – leaders are not only the Chairs of the Stakeholder Group or a constituency; I think leaders are also those who take on responsibility, sharing a Working Group, sharing a committee, and so on and so forth.

So this goes very much into the direction, taking into account that we have newcomers, which might be improved and developed, that we should look into a new [run? 00:39:18] for the leaders and for the contributors from the Stakeholder Groups and constituencies. Do you agree to the conclusion or have questions or comments? Okay, this is not the case then I will move forward to question number seven. Pretty clear: 'Would your group be interested in the leadership development program?' And we specifically asked for a leadership development program, which covers, actually, the group from question number six; the contributors and the leaders. Yes, they would, so no question; there should be some developed for the leadership level and for the contributor level.

Question number eight: 'If this program prefer to be face-to-face?' And this questions was actually in order to find out... Because there was a discussion going on before and I'm sure you'll all remember this. We really need a face-to-face program. If it's only matching a small amount of people, it is better to [give up? 00:40:48] our online program or take advantage of existing, other online programs like [Sickly? 00:40:55] Foundation or [Summer School? 00:40:58], which is not online but... Any other things that are online.



---

And I think with this question we have a clear answer; no, there is also the need for [interference 00:41:08] but from the answers before that we know that this is only half of the truth and we need those; we need a face-to-face program for leaders and contributors and we also need, separately, an online tool for the broader community, for the global community and yes, also for leaders and contributors who have not only the time to spend more time in an ICANN meeting as they do for now, already. Questions or comments on this?

This is not the case so I'll move onto question number nine. The question was: 'Who do you think should attend the [inaudible 00:41:05]?' It was possible to mark more than one, or all. It clearly says yes, there is a demand for leaders and also for potential and prospective leaders. There is a minority that is focusing on others. You can see what was specified in the small table next to the answer, but it clearly says yes, leaders, newly elected selected leaders and prospective and potential leaders should benefit from any sort of training program, either online or face-to-face.

Question number ten. With this question we tried to find out, very pragmatically, how to organize or how to move forward with our planning for these different modules within the ICANN Academy framework. And it is a pretty diverse answer with no clear statement. When such a meeting should be organized there, for all answers there are good arguments behind, but on one stage we must somehow decide – at least for a pilot program – when such a pilot program should be organized. And I would say we can take this slide majority from 38%, which says it should be the third ICANN meeting in the year, which is the

---

IGM, right after the NomCom nomination. And we should use this meeting to organize a pilot program and then learn from it whether that is the best time in the year or not.

We might come to other solutions later on but for a first pilot I would opt for the third ICANN meeting in the year and I think this... Under discussions with the set-up of the new Meeting Strategy Working Group, I think they will look into ICANN meetings are currently structured, how they will restructure them, and I think we will know more about it at a later stage if the third meeting is the right place or if it should be organized in a different manner. Questions, comments on this question number ten?

Okay, this is not the case so I will just provide you with the detailed answers on [interference 00:45:25] answer was on another time. And the answer on this question goes very much, again, in the direction that not only during the ICANN meetings is capacity building necessary, but also using other provisions, other tools, and during the whole year.

Question number 11. Again, not a very clear majority for any of the given answers. The question was 'how long would you propose to such a program now?' There is a slight majority for a two-day program and I personally think that the two-day program... The most, or has the greatest chance or the greatest possibility to be organized, one-day is probably too short, three-day is probably too long. There are other [interference 00:46:35] where [interference] again... I'm repeating myself now so I think we can take out of this question that yes, a two-day program would be the best option for a first pilot leadership program.

---

Question number 11. It was strange; the answer was not provided by the survey tool so what I did here, I listed the answers next to the picture. The question was: 'Would you prefer that such a program was scheduled prior or after an ICANN meeting?' And there was a rather, a pretty clear response on doing it prior to the ICANN meeting. One said, okay, it could also be after, three said either or, and five responses were not very clear. You can read these answers in the detailed document available on the Wiki Space, but I think this answer is pretty clear; prior to the ICANN meeting at the IGM. I think this is something we can take as a conclusion from the question... From the answers we tried to get with this survey.

Question number 13: 'How often should such a program be scheduled?' Also a clear majority to do it annually. Some people like to have it at every ICANN meeting. My assumption is that, one, at every ICANN meeting refers probably to programs like the leader [inaudible 00:48:44], the newcomers program because we always have newcomers, and they said they always accommodated and they should always be educated in a separate program, and I think this is really something which should be organized at every ICANN meeting; this is already the case. And the minority said 'on demand', I think I would not opt for this... I would not consider this answer, and there was significant amount that said... 25%, it should be other than annually. And the answers for 'others' are listed next to the picture.

And I think where it says 'monthly' or Pacific ICANN meetings twice a year or there are several training programs in place and there must be no duplication of effort – that's right, this goes very much into the

---

direction of other modules to cover other specific needs than leadership program could cover, which is organized annually; once a year. Questions or comments so far? I must admit, I did not follow the... So if there are any questions because I can only speak and I cannot read at the same time. So if there are questions which are not answered or which were raised, or comments in the Chat Room, please raise your hand and do it again.

Okay, no hands raised, then I will move forward to question number 14: 'What are the expectations, responsibilities and obligations for those who participate in [passive? 00:51:05] programs?' I think this question is a very important one because all of the efforts that are already in place, which should be developed, should be measured on their outcome and so it's very important to say, okay, what should be the outcome but how we could prove... Or if the module... If the capacity building provisions, the leadership program, the online module, could this expectation be reached? Does it serve the purpose? I will move forward to the detailed answers on this question.

You can see that the answers on this are pretty diverse and it's probably difficult for all of us to read these small letters here on the screen but what I would propose is that... And I think this is... A Working Group that we are looking into the success and to the result of each provision or of each module, which is going to be developed now. We should be able to say, okay, for this module we are expecting this and this outcome, and how can we measure this outcome? I think this is something that is very important if you spend a lot of money, actually, on any program, and it's very important for this Working Group and what ICANN will be doing in

---

the next years. Because otherwise there will always be criticism or doubt if the modules are really matching what they should actually match. Questions or comments on question number 14?

Okay. So, okay... My plans for Beijing would actually be that I would fill in this presentation with the conclusions, publish this again for comments on the ICANN Academy mailing list and I would then, only quickly, go through the results of the survey during our meeting in Beijing. On 8<sup>th</sup> April we have only one hour from 3.00 pm to 4.00 pm in the afternoon, because I would like to spend the most part of this hour discussing the online tool which is going to be developed, or which is going to be developed by [Matthew Pearce? 00:54:48]. I hope you will be available to explain a little bit of his ideas. I know he is also very much interested in what this Working Group can contribute to the development of such a comprehensive tool, and the third part of our meeting in Beijing should then be on the course of action for Durban and for Buenos Aires.

So to say if we are planning the face-to-face leadership program for Buenos Aires – as I would, reading the results of this survey – propose now to ICANN and to ICANN staff and to the Working Group and then we should agree on the course of actions and how to proceed, how to be developed – because we never really did it cross-constituency wise – we should develop a curriculum, we should agree on the trainers, we should agree on the times, on how it is going to be organized [inaudible 00:56:06], and we have a meeting in between the Durban meeting where we can meet specifically.

---

But in between I think there is a lot of work to be done to actually develop the survey... Not the survey, the curriculum and the program, the leadership program, and in parallel assisting Matthew to develop the online education tool, because we remember the ICANN Academy framework is building on the harmonization and [blinkwinization? 00:56:49] of the different modules, so it's very much important that each module is not developed separately from each other but that they are going into each other, that one module is used for another one.

The online module which will hopefully be in place for Buenos Aires or by Autumn in 2013, that we can use parts from the online module already prepared for the face-to-face leadership program and also the other way round; that somebody who participated in the leadership or in a newcomers' program can then conclude his educational training using the online education tool. This would actually be the best course... Or the best result; if there is a very synchronized approach between all the different modules.

Are there any questions, comments? Because I was speaking all the time with only very little participation from others, and I would be really interested in what you are thinking, or what general conclusion you would make? Or if you have any other ideas of how to proceed in Beijing and after? No comments at all? Okay, I see Wolf and Glenn are pretty much busy on the chat. Maybe Glenn, Wolf, do you have anything that you would like to tell us orally and not in written form? Glenn has no microphone.

Okay, if there are no questions or comments I don't want to eat up all our time because I know we are all very busy preparing for Beijing right

---

now. And I will proceed as I mentioned. I will draw the conclusions in this presentation. Open for comments on the mailing list and then for a quick review during the meeting in Beijing. But I do not expect us to spend much more time on this survey. We can then formulate, jointly, a recommendation or a proposal to be sent to ICANN staff and/or ICANN leadership and agree on the next steps for Durban and Buenos Aires.

I thank you at this stage for your participation and we remain open for any questions, after this call, on Skype. Thank you and looking forward to seeing you all soon. And hopefully in [due? 01:00:37] course for our next meeting on Monday the 8<sup>th</sup> of April. Thank you very much.

UF: Thanks very much. Bye bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Sandra.

UM: Safe travels Sandra.

[End of Transcript]

